



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The nations shall learn war no more.

THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

A MONTHLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF PEACE BETWEEN
INDIVIDUALS, CLASSES AND NATIONS.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.
SINGLE NUMBERS, TEN CENTS.

Address all communications to

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

3 Somerset Street, Boston, Mass.

Entered at the Boston Post Office as Second Class Mail Matter.

GREAT BRITAIN AND VENEZUELA.

Action of the International Arbitration and Peace Association.

This Association, whose headquarters are at 40 Outer Temple, Strand, London, passed the following resolution in reference to the Venezuela trouble on Saturday, the 21st of December. We also subjoin a statement, sent us by the Secretary, of the various attempts made by the Association to induce the British Foreign Office to submit the whole question to arbitration. These attempts have been fruitless, but they have been highly commendable. If all the friends of peace throughout Great Britain had been as faithful, what a world of trouble and anxiety might have been saved on both sides of the Atlantic!

RESOLUTION.

"That the long-standing boundary dispute with Venezuela having resulted in a grave crisis between this country and the United States, this Committee, having repeatedly urged in accordance with its principles that the aforesaid dispute should be submitted to arbitration, while regretting the attitude assumed in President Cleveland's Message to the United States Congress and not recognizing the right of the United States Government to decide the question, re-asserts its position, and once more expresses the hope that the whole subject matter of the dispute may even now be referred to independent and impartial arbitration."

STATEMENT.

In December, 1892, the Committee wrote to the Foreign Office stating that, from information it had received, the new government in Venezuela, under President Crespo, would probably be favorably inclined to any proposal likely to bring about a renewal of good relations between the two governments, and that if no agreement could be arrived at recourse should be had to arbitration. The Foreign Office replied that the government of Venezuela was fully aware of the terms on which her Majesty's Government would renew diplomatic relations.

In the autumn of 1893, the Committee endeavored to arrange a conference between Dr. Michelena (the special envoy from the Venezuelan Government) and some British members of Parliament, but Dr. Michelena consider-

ing that he had better see only official representatives of the government, this proposal fell through.

In November, 1893, the Committee again wrote to the Foreign Office pointing out the disadvantages of the then existing state of affairs, and urged that practical efforts should be made towards a settlement.

The Foreign Office replied that some of the claims of the Venezuelan Government were "so unfounded in fact, and so unfair to the colony of British Guiana, as not to be properly a subject for arbitration."

In February, 1894, application was made to the Foreign Office as to what these "unfounded and unfair" claims were. The Foreign Office replied that there was nothing to be added to its former reply.

In June, 1894, on the occasion of the announcement of hostile resolutions to be submitted to the Venezuelan Senate as to trade with England and the suspension of the payment of interest on the English debt, the Committee wrote to the Foreign Office submitting that England ought not to be judge in her own cause, and again urging arbitration.

This was duly acknowledged by the Foreign Office.

In December, 1894, on the occasion of President Cleveland's Message to Congress in which he stated that he had urged arbitration on Great Britain, the Committee wrote to the Foreign Office suggesting the renewal of diplomatic relations, as a first step towards an amicable settlement, and asking for full and specific information.

This having been acknowledged, the Committee, in February, 1895, again wrote to the Foreign Office asking to be favored with fuller and more definite information, but this was refused. In April 1, 1895, Mr. W. P. Byles (then member for the Shipley Division of Yorkshire) put a question in the House of Commons, on behalf of the Association, but no fresh information was given by Sir E. Grey (then Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs) in reply.

Finally, in October last the Committee again drew the attention of the Foreign Office to the importance of some amicable settlement of the question being arrived at, which letter was duly acknowledged.

THE DOCTRINE OF NON-INTERFERENCE.

BY JEROME DOWD,

Professor of Political Economy and Social Science, Trinity College, N. C.

The recent rebellion in Cuba, the massacres in Armenia, and the dispute over the boundary line of Venezuela, have aroused the public mind in all civilized countries upon the subject of international law and morals, and brought to the minds of the people the question as to what extent and under what circumstances is one nation justified in interfering with the affairs of another over which it has no political control?

Until recent years nations were more inclined to interfere than to adopt the negative policy. This is especially true of Great Britain, where the growth of the non-intervention principle has been very slow, the first assertion of it having been made by Mr. Canning in 1826.

However, in latter days, the engines of death are so terrible, that nations are extremely cautious about interfering with the affairs of each other. The proba-